OTPE CIE

11000 2874

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no	U.S. Pate	PTO/SB/21 (08-0: Approved for use through 08/30/2003. OMB 0651-003 ent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC tion of information unless it displays a yalid OMB control numbe
	Application Number	10/035,829
TRANSMITTAL	Filing Date	10/18/2001
FORM	First Named Inventor	Vlad J. Novotny
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing	Art Unit	2874
	Examiner Name	Unknown
Total Number of Pages in This Submission 16	Attorney Docket Number	AONIP001C1
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
Fee Transmittal Form Fee Attached Amendment/Reply After Final Affidavits/declaration(s) Extension of Time Request Express Abandonment Request Information Disclosure Statement Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Drawing(s) Licensing-related Papers Petition Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Add Terminal Disclaimer Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s) Remarks Application Data Sheet - 2 pages. Return Receipt Postcard	After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC) Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC (AppealN otice, Brief, Reply Brief) Proprietary Information
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, A TTORNEY, OR AGENT		
Firm or Individual name Signature Signature Date 10/20/03	Arthur J. Behiel, Patent Attorney	
CER	TIFICATE OF TRANSMISSIO	N/MAILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being	g facsimile transmitted to the USPTO of	or deposited with the United States Postal Service with atents, P.O.B ox 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on
Typed or printed name Laurie Moreno		
Signature Date 10/20/03		

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C.1 22 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sentto the Chief Information Officer, U.S.P atent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Vlad J. Novotny and Parvinder Dhillon

Assignee: Active Optical Networks, Inc.

Title: "MICRO-OPTO-ELECTRO-MECHANICAL SWITCHING

SYSTEM"

Serial No.: 10/035,829 File Date: 10/18/01

Examiner: Unknown Art Unit: 2874

Docket No.: AON1P001C1 (AO-666)

Mail Stop Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Domestic Priority Claim Information to Update the Filing Receipt

Dear Sir:

Applicants have amended the "Domestic Priority Claim and Continuity Information" on the enclosed Application Data Sheet in an attempt to comply with the new Patent Office requirements for indicating specified relationships between applications to claim the benefit of prior applications under 35 USC §120. Unfortunately, those new Patent Office requirements are vague and confusing, and contradict historic understanding as well as current and former laws and Patent Office rules. As such, applicants are unsure of how to characterize the various applications, and have amended the sections to appease the Patent Office but cannot

PATENT

provide any assurance as to which of several unclear and contradictory relationship definitions the applications may assume.

For example, MPEP §201.07 (R1, Feb. 2003) states: "A continuation is a second application for the same invention claimed in a prior nonprovisional application and filed before the original prior application becomes abandoned or patented." However, MPEP §804, listing the requirements of double patenting rejections (including provisional rejections), states: "Where the claims of an application are substantively the same as those of a first patent, they are barred under 35 U.S.C. 101 - the statutory basis for a double patenting rejection. A rejection based on double patenting of the 'same invention' type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101." Thus, according to the definition of continuation application provided by MPEP §201.07, no valid continuation of a patent can exist, in contrast to long-standing patent practice and many thousands of issued patents.

According to MPEP §201.08 (R1, Feb. 2003): "A continuation-in-part is an application filed during the lifetime of an earlier nonprovisional application, repeating some substantial portion or all of the earlier nonprovisional application and adding matter not disclosed in the said earlier nonprovisional application." This is in contrast to the Notice in the March 18, 2003 Official Gazette of the USPTO, which states: "the designation of an application as a continuation (rather than as a continuation-in-part) is an indication that the entire invention claimed in an application has support in the prior application, whereas the designation of an application as a continuation-in-part is an indication that the claimed

invention is not entirely supported by the prior application." In other words, to define a CIP the MPEP looks to whether an application has added subject matter, whereas the Official Gazzette Notice directs applicants to determine whether the claimed invention is entirely supported by the prior application, without regard to whether subject matter has been added.

Neither 35 U.S.C §120 nor 37 CFR §1.78 requires the characterization of an application as a continuation versus a divisional versus a continuation-in-part. Perhaps for this reason, the MPEP in effect a few months ago made it clear that the terms "continuation," "CIP," "divisional," etc. had no legal significance. As stated in MPEP Edition 8, §201.11: "Continuing applications include those applications which are called divisions, continuations, and continuations-in-part. As far as the right under the statute is concerned the name used is immaterial, the names being merely expressions developed for convenience. The statute is so worded that the first application may contain more than the second, or the second application may contain more than the first, and in either case the second application is entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the first as to the common subject matter."

Given the vague, confusing and contradictory meanings proposed by the Patent Office, applicants are unsure what a "continuation application" is, what a "continuation-in-part application" is and what a "divisional application" is.

Applicants therefore resubmit their status letter and related papers mailed May 5, 2003, along with an updated Application Data Sheet.

PATENT

Applicants therefore request the filing receipt "Domestic Priority Data as Claimed by Applicant" section to be updated with the information found in the accompanying Application Data Sheet.

Respectfully Submitted,

Arthur J. Behiel

Reg. No. 39,603

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450, on OCTOBE C 307 2003.

Laurie Moreno

Name

Signature